

**MEETING TITLE: Standards Committee**

**DATE: October 31, 2002**

**ATTENDEES: Vicki Kirkpatrick, Steve Kutz, Mary Looker, Rick Mockler, Randy Phillips, Nancy Reid, Don Sloma, Christie Spice, Kim Thorburn, Linc Weaver, Jan Wright, Jackson Williams, Susan Lybarger, Joan Brewster, Rita Schmidt**

ISSUES	DISCUSSION	DECISIONS	FOR ACTION
Baseline measurement reports and exemplary practices-report from the Consultants: Barbara Mauer, Marni Mason, Bruce Brown  (presentation available separately)	Overview of the draft report “Baseline Assessment results and Recommendations” which includes the results and recommendations. Presentation on aggregate results for both LHJ’s and DOH. Review of aggregate strengths and weaknesses by standard area. Each site will receive the state aggregate report as well as their own site report. Reports will include results grouped by weighted averages, straight % and will show results grouped by like sites. The reports will be mailed in late November. Recommendations for system wide actions: Increasing consistency across the system, increasing role clarity at the state and local level, increasing financing and staff, improving and increasing staff skills, increasing the use of quality improvement and program evaluation skills, provide more trainings on the standards and by topic areas, sustaining the standards process.  A total of 750 documents showing exemplary practice were collected and will become available statewide on a WEB site through DOH in January.	DOH will get a complete copy of each report and WSALPHO will either have access to the reports or retain a copy in their office. Media and other requests for information about the results of any site will be referred to that site to obtain the information.	The consultants recommend that each site prepare a work plan to address improvements against the standards.
Communication toolkit- Tim Church, Kate Lynch, Jill Hanks	Examples of possible fact sheets and question and answer were discussed. The plan is to distribute these with the reports.	Will include: Suggested talking points, Question and Answer Sheet, Fact Sheet, Template for results and recommendations with “fill in the blanks” May also include: suggested newsletter article, power point or overhead presentation for local Board of Health.	Committee members to give input and suggestions for the development of the pieces to the toolkit.

Report on the interim work –the conference calls (see separate summaries)	Overall themes: There is a need to analyze the findings to create a prioritized list of system wide approaches for improvement. There is a need for a process to create the list. Communication tools are important and need to have consistent messages, with plans for their use. Developing a system wide approach to improvement will have benefits for the system as a whole. The connection between the work of the Standards Committee and the Finance Committee needs to be explored further. Another possible strategy would be to analyze funding streams to determine consistency with the Standards and to integrate the Standards into grant applications and decisions regarding which funding to pursue.	Incorporate ideas into recommendations for the PHIP.	Hold a joint meeting of the Standards Committee and the Finance Committee.
<p>Recommendations for the PHIP: Should assessment of all LHJ's and DOH occur on a regular basis?</p> <p>What should be the methodology for future assessments of the Standards?</p> <p>How can system-wide improvements be made?</p> <p>Should the administrative aspects of the public health system be addressed in the standards work?</p>	<p>It is important that reviews happen on a regular basis to keep staff aware. Agencies should use a self assessment tool in interim time periods. The cycle of reviews should not be too burdensome. Consultants recommend that the time of year be changed.</p> <p>Current contract for the assessment is \$150,000 and actual cost exceeds that amount. Some aspects have been developed. Committing staff resources to participate in a team is very difficult. Inter-rater reliability is a concern for any process used. Could a Quality Improvement office(like Florida) be created that would have responsibility for the assessments. Could sites be done on a rotating basis and spread over a several year time period.</p> <p>Now that the standards are developed and a baseline measurement has occurred and we have system wide results, should a plan be developed to impact the overall functioning of the public health system. Should the Public Health System leadership identify overarching issues that would benefit from system wide improvements? The goal would be to bring the entire system into compliance on specific measures.</p> <p>A subcommittee of the Standards Committee identified the administrative functions made recommendations to the Standards Committee. Administrative areas were identified and some work towards the development of measures has occurred. The subcommittee recommended that Administrative Measures should be developed, that the assessments should happen separate from the public health assessments. Further work would need to be done on the measures. It was also recommended that both the Finance and Indicators group of the PHIP review the measures for duplication. The measures developed would need to be pilot tested and finalized. A workplan has been proposed.</p>	<p>Next assessment will occur in 2 ¾ years with self assessment in between.</p> <p>No decision was made.</p> <p>Establish a process to use the measurement results to set priorities for system wide improvements.</p> <p>Implement the work plan to proceed to develop administrative measures.</p>	<p>Identify process steps.</p> <p>Communicate with other two PHIP committees, create a set of standards, develop test sites.</p>
Letter to Local Boards of Health and Commissioners (attached)	It would be good to send this to coincide with the distribution of the reports.	Approved to send.	


**Next Meeting: November 20, 2002**